



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2011

---

## **The evolution of food sharing in primates**

Jaeggi, A V ; van Schaik, C P

**Abstract:** The aim of this study is to explain the occurrence of food sharing across primates. Defined as the unresisted transfer of food, evolutionary hypotheses have to explain why possessors should relinquish food rather than keep it. While sharing with offspring can be explained by kin selection, explanations for sharing among unrelated adults are more controversial. Here we test the hypothesis that sharing occurs with social partners that have leverage over food possessors due to the opportunity for partner choice in other contexts. Thus, we predict that possessors should relinquish food to potential mates or allies, who could provide or withhold matings or coalitionary support in the future. We used phylogenetic analyses based on both maximum likelihood and Bayesian approaches in a sample of 68 primate species to test these predictions. The analyses strongly indicate that (1) sharing with offspring is predicted by the relative processing difficulty of the diet, as measured by the degree of extractive foraging, but not overall diet quality, (2) food sharing among adults only evolved in species already sharing with offspring, regardless of diet, and (3) male–female sharing co-evolved with the opportunity for female mate choice and sharing within the sexes with coalition formation. These results provide comparative support for the hypothesis that sharing is “traded” for matings and coalitionary support in the sense that these services are statistically associated and can thus be selected for. Based on this, we predict that sharing should occur in any species with opportunities for partner choice.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-011-1221-3>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-57055>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Jaeggi, A V; van Schaik, C P (2011). The evolution of food sharing in primates. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65(11):2125-2140.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-011-1221-3>



## The evolution of food sharing in primates

Journal:	<i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i>
Manuscript ID:	BES-11-0037.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Jaeggi, Adrian; University of Zurich, Anthropological Institute & Museum; University of Zurich, Research Priority Program in Ethics; University of California Santa Barbara, Integrative Anthropological Sciences van Schaik, Carel; University of Zurich, Anthropological Insitute & Museum
Keywords:	Coalitions, Cooperation, Food sharing, Mate choice, Provisioning, Reciprocal altruism, Social bonds

**The evolution of food sharing in primates**

ADRIAN V. JAEGGI<sup>1,2,3\*</sup> & CAREL P. VAN SCHAIK<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Anthropological Institute and Museum, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstr. 190,  
8057 Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Research Priority Program in Ethics, University of Zurich, Zollikerstr. 117, 8008  
Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Integrative Anthropological Sciences, University of California Santa Barbara, Santa  
Barbara, CA 93106-3210, USA

\*corresponding author

**Author contact:**

**e-mail:** ajaeggi@anth.ucsb.edu

**Phone:** +1 805 455 8587

**Key words:** coalitions, cooperation, food sharing, mate choice, reciprocal altruism,  
social bonds

## Abstract

The aim of this study is to explain the occurrence of food sharing across primates. Defined as the unresisted transfer of food, evolutionary hypotheses have to explain why possessors should relinquish food rather than keep it. While sharing with offspring can be explained by kin selection, explanations for sharing among unrelated adults are controversial. Here we test the hypothesis that sharing occurs with social partners that have leverage over food possessors due to the opportunity for partner choice in other contexts. Thus, we predict that possessors should relinquish food to potential mates or allies, who could provide or withhold matings or coalitionary support in the future. We used phylogenetic analyses based on both maximum likelihood and Bayesian approaches in a sample of 68 primate species to test these predictions. The analyses strongly indicate that (i) sharing with offspring is predicted by the relative processing difficulty of the diet, as measured by the degree of extractive foraging, but not overall diet quality, (ii) food sharing among adults only evolved in species already sharing with offspring, regardless of diet, and that (iii) male-female sharing co-evolved with the opportunity for female mate choice and sharing within the sexes with coalition formation. These results provide comparative support for the hypothesis that sharing is “traded” for matings and coalitionary support in the sense that these services are statistically associated and can thus be selected for. Based on this, we predict that sharing should occur in any species with opportunities for partner choice.

## 49 Introduction

50 Food sharing (henceforth: sharing) is defined as the unresisted transfer of food  
51 from one food-motivated individual, the “possessor”, to another, the “recipient”  
52 (Feistner and McGrew 1989). We define possession as being in physical contact with  
53 the food and this definition excludes transfers in which there was no clear possession,  
54 such as collecting scraps from the vicinity of a feeding individual. Thus, it should be  
55 clear that our trait of interest is that possessors voluntarily (as far as we can infer)  
56 relinquish food to the benefit of the recipient, which requires an evolutionary  
57 explanation. Sharing with related offspring is relatively common in various animal taxa  
58 (Clutton-Brock 1991; Ydenberg 1994; Brown et al. 2004; Mas and Kölliker 2008;  
59 Rapaport and Brown 2008) and its evolution can be explained by kin selection  
60 (Hamilton 1964). In contrast, sharing among unrelated adults is far less common and the  
61 benefits of sharing to possessors may vary in different taxa (Stevens and Gilby 2004). It  
62 is therefore surprising that among non-human primates, non-kin sharing is relatively  
63 common (Feistner and McGrew 1989; Brown et al. 2004).

64 There are two major hypotheses to explain non-kin sharing in primates:  
65 harassment and reciprocal exchange (Feistner and McGrew 1989; Brown et al. 2004)<sup>1</sup>.  
66 While the two hypotheses are not mutually exclusive (Stevens and Gilby 2004; Gilby  
67 2006), harassment is often assumed to be the more parsimonious explanation because it  
68 does not evoke delayed benefits but describes sharing as a mutualistic interaction  
69 (Stevens and Stephens 2002; Clutton-Brock 2009). Furthermore, the fact that the vast  
70 majority of transfers in primates are passive (>95% in most species, reviewed by Jaeggi  
71 et al. 2010a) also supports the notion that it is induced by harassment. According to

---

<sup>1</sup>Other hypotheses explaining sharing in humans or other animals such as costly signaling are not discussed here because there is no convincing evidence supporting them in primates

Stevens and Stephens' (2002) harassment model possessors share to avoid the costs (in terms of decreased consumption rate) inflicted by beggars. Similarly, tolerated theft models explain sharing by the differential marginal value of food to increasingly sated possessors vs. continually hungry beggars in light of the constant costs of defending food (Blurton Jones 1984; Blurton Jones 1987). In both models, the possessors' cost/benefit ratio is manipulated by beggars in such a way that sharing is the most beneficial option.

Although the harassment model provides a strong and simple explanation for why sharing occurs at all, an additional explanation may sometimes be warranted to explain the specific possessor-recipient combinations seen to share food and the distribution of sharing across species. For instance, some troops of olive baboons (*Papio anubis*) hunt and eat meat, possession is biased towards dominant males and sharing is rare, suggesting that the costs of defending food are small for dominant possessors (Strum 1975; Strum 1981). Surprisingly, the few instances of sharing do not occur with other males but rather with females, who are much smaller than males and should be less costly to rebuff. Rather than the harassment costs inflicted on males, what seems to be the decisive factor are the *social costs* of rebuffing females: sharing almost exclusively occurs with consort partners or, if outside of consorts, among males and females "*with previously established affiliative bond*" (Strum 1981, p. 278, emphasis added). Hence, by not sharing, the male might risk to upset and possibly lose his consort or long-term social partner, both of which could decrease his mating chances and thus ultimately his reproductive success. These social costs have actually been shown in orangutans, where males share easily defensible food with females because females

may end the association by seeking out other males if the male does not comply, thus eliminating his mating opportunities (van Noordwijk and van Schaik 2009).

The idea of social costs has long been acknowledged in human food sharing, where stingy individuals may be excluded from future shares (Hill and Kaplan 1993; Gurven 2004), and “when weighing the costs of defending a resource against tolerated theft, therefore, an owner can be expected to include in the costs the likelihood of any forgone future favors” (Cashdan 1997, p. 69). Hence, harassment-induced sharing is inextricably linked to the social relationships of the individuals involved. Even if primates cannot consciously represent future costs, natural selection should thus favor the respective emotional proxies (Schino and Aureli 2009) to make possessors respond more to the harassment of an important social partner.

This indicates that harassment-induced sharing does not preclude reciprocal exchange as long as it can be selective. Indeed, there is some good evidence among chimpanzees that sharing is usually directed towards important social partners. For instance, dominant males at Mahale will try to gain possession of carcasses after a successful hunt and only their long-term allies are allowed in the begging cluster, where they can get a share of the meat (Kawanaka 1982; Nishida et al. 1992). Long-term allies are more likely than other males to provide the dominant male with grooming or coalitionary support in the future, having already done so in the past. This selective sharing with important social partners thus leads to a statistical association with other social services and can explain why almost every statistical test for reciprocal exchange among chimpanzees found some evidence for it (e.g. de Waal 1989; de Waal 1997; Gilby 2006; Mitani 2006; Gomes and Boesch 2009; Jaeggi et al. 2010c).

Although many are reluctant to embrace the idea of reciprocal exchange among animals (e.g. Clutton-Brock 2009) because of the supposed cognitive constraints (Stevens and Hauser 2004), there is a lot of good evidence for a statistical contingency between favors given and received over long time periods (see, e.g. Watts 2002; Schino 2007; Gomes et al. 2009; and food sharing references mentioned above). Such exchanges do not have to be regulated by sophisticated cognitive mechanisms but could reflect social bonds with loose emotional (rather than strict mental) score-keeping, just like friendships in humans (Trivers 1971; Silk 2002; Schino and Aureli 2009). Such bonds are formed in many primate species (Cords 1997; Tomasello and Call 1997; Silk 2002; Massen et al. 2010) and are sufficient to account for the loose exchange of low-cost altruistic acts common in primate groups (Schino and Aureli 2009).

In sum, the aim of this paper is to trace the evolution of food sharing in primates and explain its occurrence across species. We will first test hypotheses that explain the evolution of sharing with offspring, and then sharing among (unrelated) adults. In particular, we test the hypothesis that sharing among adults coevolved with opportunities for partner choice, giving recipients leverage over possessors because they can withhold future services such as mating or coalitionary support, thus inflicting *social costs* on stingy possessors. By selectively tolerating harassment from recipients who have such leverage, possessors avoid these social costs which leads to a statistical association of favors given and received over longer time periods and this selective tolerance can thus be favored by natural selection. While many studies have tested for reciprocal exchange within a species, we take a comparative approach and test for the correlated evolution of sharing with conditions that favor reciprocal exchange in a large sample of primates. In particular, we suggest that the opportunity for female mate



choice can account for male-female sharing and coalition formation for sharing within the sexes. This is the first study to conduct a phylogenetically controlled analysis on the conditions associated with food sharing in primates and thus extends intraspecific analyses in important ways that allow predictions about species not included in this sample.

## Methods

### Comparative sample

We compiled an exhaustive list of 173 references related to sharing in primates (Table 1). Species were included in the analyses if either sharing had been reported or if no sharing had been reported despite considerable study effort (at least 10 behavioral studies on the species listed in ISI Web of Science by end of 2010). Sharing with offspring and among adults was quantified as absent (0), present (1: mentioned occasionally) or common (2: more than one study explicitly addressing sharing) or present (1) or absent (0), depending on the statistical method (see Comparative Analyses). Furthermore, sharing between particular sex combinations of adults, namely from males to females, among males and among females, was scored as present or absent. Sharing from females to males was too rare to test and there is no clear hypothesis associated with it. If the only reported sharing occurred in artificial experimental settings but never in naturalistic conditions and it was not clear whether the reported sharing was tolerated or resisted it was not counted as present (since the trait of interest is *tolerated* sharing). In particular, this concerns sharing in *Saimiri sciureus* (Fragaszy and Mason 1983; Stevens 2004) and adult *Hylobates lar* (Schessler and Nash 1977; Nettelbeck 1998). Thus, a total of 68 primate species could be included in the comparative sample (Table 1, Figure 1).

(insert Table 1 about here)

(insert Figure 1 about here)

### Predictor variables

In the following section we elaborate the hypotheses explaining the evolution of sharing with offspring as well as sharing among adults in general and within specific sex combinations, and provide predictor variables to test them in a comparative analysis. It should be noted that variables in a comparative study, where the units of analysis are *species*, are necessarily much cruder than in within species analysis where we can correlate one detailed behavioral measure with another on the level of *individuals* (e.g. A sharing food with B, with B providing coalitionary support to A). Thus, rather than describing a precise behavioral mechanism, we can identify the conditions under which natural selection could install such mechanisms. While the variables may not be ideal, comparative analyses are unlikely to produce false positives and have the additional benefit that they allow us to infer the presence of certain traits in other species, given the conditions found to be predictive in this sample, which can subsequently be confirmed with more detailed study.

### Sharing with offspring

Sharing with offspring will be favored by kin selection when the costs of relinquishing food are relatively low for parents or helpers and the benefits of receiving food are high for offspring. This should be the case when there is high variation and differential skill in food acquisition, or, in other words, when adults regularly acquire food which the offspring cannot yet acquire themselves. As transfers of such food items do not only provide the offspring with additional nutrients but also with information about the affordances of otherwise unreachable items, this has also been named the

*informational hypothesis* (Brown et al. 2004). Here we operationalize the required skill in food acquisition by the degree of *extractive foraging*, as defined by Gibson (1986). Species were thus classified as non-extractive foragers (0), un-skilled/specialized extractive foragers (1) and skilled extractive foragers (2). In contrast to Gibson (1986) we classified *Pongo* as skilled extractive foragers since there is now good evidence for complex extractive foraging skills such as tool-use (van Schaik et al. 1996) and that skills are acquired through prolonged periods of social and individual learning in both orangutan species (Forss et al. 2009; Jaeggi et al. 2010b).

Furthermore, it has been proposed that adults may use food provisioning to increase growth rates and facilitate weaning and that sharing with offspring should thus specifically target high quality food items. This is known as the *nutritional hypothesis* (Brown et al. 2004). Thus, we predicted that sharing with offspring should be more common in species with high quality diets, possibly in interaction with extractive foraging. We operationalized this by using a *diet quality index* (DQI), as defined by Fish & Lockwood (2003):

$$DQI = 0.33L + 0.67F + M$$

where L, F, and M are the percentages of time spent foraging for leaves and other vegetative plant parts, fruit (including gum and flowers), and meat (indeed, any animal matter), respectively. The possible range of DQI values is 0.33–1. The values were obtained directly from Fish & Lockwood (2003) or calculated from Rowe (1996). If numbers were unavailable for a species, the value of the sister species was used.

#### *Sharing among adults (general)*

Our first prediction, inspired by classic ethology is that sharing among adults is derived from sharing with offspring, the same way courtship feeding in birds is derived

from chick provisioning (Tinbergen 1952; Lorenz 1965). Indeed, most affiliative behaviors and their proximate regulations are derived from the mother-offspring context (Hrdy 1999; Hrdy 2009) and the presence of *sharing with offspring* may thus be a *precondition or a constraint* on the evolution of sharing among adults.

Furthermore, as in sharing with offspring, one would predict sharing among adults to occur whenever the cost/benefit-ratio of transferring the food item at stake is favorable, in particular when food items are large and/or highly valuable and when possession is biased and/or unpredictable (Kaplan and Hill 1985). Indeed, most sharing occurs with items that fulfill these criteria, such as meat (e.g. Strum 1975; Perry and Rose 1994; Utami and van Hooff 1997; Stanford 1999; Mitani and Watts 2001; Hohmann and Fruth 2008; Gomes and Boesch 2009) or large fruits (e.g. White 1994; Hockings et al. 2007; D. Watts, pers.comm.). However, sharing also occasionally occurs with easily defendable or accessible food items such as small fruits (Slocombe and Newton-Fisher 2005; van Noordwijk and van Schaik 2009) or plentiful browse (Kavanagh 1972) suggesting that the social relationships of the involved individuals were more important than the food items at stake. Nonetheless, it is possible that diet acts as a constraint on the evolution of adult sharing and we thus included the same diet variables used to explain sharing with offspring, i.e. *extractive foraging* and *diet quality index* in the analyses.

#### *Sharing from males to females – Female mate choice and pair bonds (“Food for sex”)*

Popularly known as the meat-for-sex hypothesis, it is sometimes assumed that males “buy” immediate mating benefits with high quality food. However, in chimpanzees contingent exchanges of food and matings (in the short term) are rare and males also commonly share with lactating females (reviewed by Gilby et al. 2010).

238 Sharing is therefore better seen as an expression of long-term investment in social  
239 relationships that might eventually relate to higher mating success, possibly because *not*  
240 sharing might lead to *lower* mating success. Thus the hypothesis can be formulated  
241 more generally: Whenever females can exert mate choice, males should allow females  
242 to take food in order to maintain their chances of mating with the female in the future  
243 (Strum 1981; Gomes and Boesch 2009; van Noordwijk and van Schaik 2009). In more  
244 proximate terms, it could be said that in the presence of female choice, males and  
245 females may form affiliative social bonds, one expression of which is the sharing of  
246 food. Hence we predict that *female mate choice* favors sharing from males to females.

247       How do we operationalize female choice? First of all, we have to make clear that  
248 we are interested in behavioral female choice (and not cryptic female choice), wherein  
249 females initiate or terminate association, consortship or mating (Clutton-Brock and  
250 McAuliffe 2009), because the consequences of these behaviors are actually experienced  
251 by males and can thus shape their own behavior. Ideally, we would use a direct measure  
252 of expressed female choice such as the percentage of female-initiated matings or refused  
253 matings. However, such detailed behavioral data are not available for a large sample of  
254 species. More generally, female preferences for certain males occur in virtually every  
255 species in which researchers have looked for it (Keddy-Hector 1992; Clutton-Brock and  
256 McAuliffe 2009). It is difficult to compare the relative influence of female preferences  
257 on the distribution of matings across species because this distribution may also be  
258 influenced by other factors. For instance, mating skew can be a consequence of both  
259 female preference as well as male coercion and male-male competition which can both  
260 constrain female choice (Clutton-Brock and McAuliffe 2009). Furthermore, female  
261 preferences can vary between species such that mating skew may be high in one species

because all females prefer the alpha male but low in other species because females prefer to mate with many males. Other measures such as paternity concentration introduce yet more confounding effects like cryptic female choice or sperm competition. Hence, no clear behavioral measure that captures the actually expressed degree of female choice is available across species.

One thing however is certain: where there is only one male, there is little or no opportunity for female choice. As obvious as it may sound, this can have serious consequences for male-female relationships: For instance, in species where both one-male and multi-male groups occur, female choice is expressed only in multi-male groups (Launhardt et al. 2001), and only males in multi-male groups engage in consorts (Hamilton and Bulger 1992). In species that live in one-male units but form modular societies, which are effectively like multi-male groups because other males are constantly present and threaten to lure away or take over females, male-female grooming rates within units are significantly higher than in non-modular species (Grueter 2009). In fact, affiliative male-female relationships have never been reported in single-male, multi-female groups but are common in multi-male, multi-female groups (Tomasello and Call 1997; Silk 2002). Hence we use the occurrence of *multi-male groups* in a species (yes/no) as a proxy for the opportunity for female choice (Source: Rowe 1996), because the only clear “0’s” for female choice are one-male groups. If different types of social organization occur in a species, the multi-male score was given. It is important to point out that the presence of multiple males does not simply lead to more opportunities for sharing, because male-female proximity is generally *lower* in multi-male groups (e.g. baboons vs. langurs), otherwise females would be

monopolizable by a single male and it would not be a multi-male group (van Schaik and van Hooff 1983). Hence a positive result is not a byproduct of male-female proximity.

In addition, we used a bibliographic frequency measure to validate our use of this binary variable and to predict the actually expressed frequency of male-female sharing and female mate choice within multi-male species. To this end, we searched the ISI Web of Science (all years) for the name of species X (e.g. “*Pan troglodytes*”), and also for the name of species X and the term “female mate choice” (e.g. “*Pan troglodytes* female mate choice”). We then divided the number of male-female food sharing studies on species X from Table 1 by the number of hits for the search on that species (we’ll call this variable *bibliographic frequency of male-female food sharing*) and the number of hits on species X and “female mate choice” by the total number of hits on species X (*bibliographic frequency of female mate choice*).

Another hypothesis is that male-female sharing is a form of provisioning or mating effort in pair-bonded species (e.g. Fragasz and Mason 1983; Wolovich et al. 2006; Wolovich et al. 2008a; Wolovich et al. 2008b). Because pair bonds mainly occur in single-male species, we tested this hypothesis by comparing male-female sharing in *socially monogamous* vs. harem (single-male, multi-female) species (Source: Rowe 1996). If other types of social organization (e.g. polyandry) also occur in a species, the monogamy score was given.

#### Sharing among males / among females – Coalitions (“Food for support”)

In species in which individuals may form coalitions during agonistic interactions, potential recipients have leverage over possessors because they may provide or withhold coalitionary support in the future. As with female mate choice, it is the possibility of partner choice in coalition formation, and hence the risk of losing a

valuable partner, that should make possessors comply with recipients' request. Thus we predict that the occurrence of sharing is associated with the occurrence of *coalitions* (yes/no) across species. In particular, sharing among males should be associated with male-male coalitions and sharing among females with female-female coalitions (Source: Plavcan et al. 1995). In order to control for the possibility that both sharing and coalition formation independently evolved by kin selection alone, we also restricted the dataset to non-kin, i.e. we scored all species as "0" in which the only reported instances of sharing occurred among relatives, as indicated by the authors of the respective studies (Table 1).

Future analyses could also incorporate more detailed variables such as the relative frequency of coalitions and their contribution to an individual's reproductive success as well as same-sex grooming rates. We propose that the presence or absence of coalitions is an appropriate predictor for the presence or absence of social bonds which are translated into the presence or absence of sharing per se, whereas the more detailed measures above could be used to quantify the relative strength of these bonds and thus predict the frequency of sharing.

#### Comparative analyses

We used both maximum likelihood and Bayesian approaches to test for correlated evolution of the traits of interest while controlling for phylogenetic non-independence. The phylogeny of primates including branch lengths was based on Bininda-Emonds et al. (2007, see Figure 1). First, we fitted phylogenetic regression models using generalized estimating equations (GEE) for discrete traits and phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) for continuous variables (Paradis 2006). All models were fitted with the ape package (Paradis et al. 2009) in R 2.12.1 (R



Development Core Team 2010), with binomial (for binary traits) or poisson (for 0/1/2) error distributions for GEE, and Brownian correlation structure for PGLS.

Second, for binary traits we also used a Bayesian method called reversible-jump Markov chain Monte Carlo (RJ MCMC, Pagel and Meade 2006). RJ MCMCs are used to model the evolution of two binary traits assuming either dependent or independent evolution (the latter being the null hypothesis). Similar to a likelihood-ratio test, the dependent and independent models are compared by their harmonic means, the Bayesian equivalent of the log-likelihood, by calculating the log Bayes factor (BF). Rather than testing the BF against a distribution such as chi square, by convention, a BF >2 is taken as positive evidence for dependent evolution, BF >5 as strong positive evidence and BF >10 as very strong positive evidence (Pagel and Meade 2006). Furthermore, even in the dependent models, the chain can visit models with independent evolution. Thus, if the proportion of independent models visited,  $P_{\text{independent}}$ , is small, the null hypothesis of independent evolution of the two traits can also be rejected.

In addition, RJ MCMC can be used to indicate the likelihood of trait changes, so-called “rate parameters”,  $q$  (Pagel and Meade 2006). If two traits can have the states 0,0 (both absent), 0,1 (first trait absent, second trait present), 1,0 (first trait present, second trait absent) or 1,1 (both traits present), the rate parameters  $q$  indicate the likelihood of transition between these states (cf. Figure 3). Hence, one can test whether the evolution of one trait, e.g. “sharing among adults”, is more likely in the presence or the absence of the other trait, e.g. “sharing with offspring”, by comparing the  $q$  for the transition from 0,1 to 1,1 with the  $q$  for the transition from 0,0 to 1,0. For a first examination of this, one can plot the posterior distribution of rate parameters simulated by the RJ MCMC (cf. Online Resource 1). Furthermore, one can graphically indicate

the likely evolutionary routes of state transitions by modifying the thickness of the arrows according to the mean rate parameters (cf. Figure 3). In all models, the ancestral state for every trait was estimated to be 0 or 1 with almost equal probability (range of probability for 0 = 0.49-0.53). However, given that relinquishing food to another individual's benefit as well as providing coalitionary support is costly and thus more unexpected than not doing so, and given that ancestral primates were most probably solitary and nocturnal and all other social systems derived (van Schaik and van Hooff 1983), we propose that ancestral states were probably 0,0.

RJ MCMC models were run in BayesTraits 1.0 (Pagel and Meade) with a burn-in of 50,000 and 5,050,000 iterations in total, except for male-female sharing, for which 10,050,000 iterations were run because the Markov chains tended to converge later. The first 1,000,000 iterations (2,000,000 for male-female) were discarded. We used an exponential hyperprior (Pagel et al. 2004) because of the relatively weak signal in the data (compared to, e.g. genetic data) and because small values of parameters were more likely than larger ones (i.e. the traits of interest evolved only relatively rarely), and made sure the posterior distribution of parameters was not truncated by the range of the parameter (see Online Resource 1). We used three different Rate Deviation settings and each model was run six times for each setting to verify that the results were stable (see Online Resource 2). The reported BF and  $P_{\text{independent}}$  are based on means of the six runs for the Rate Deviation setting that produced the best converging chains and recommended acceptance (see Online Resource 2). Furthermore, for each analysis we plotted the Markov chains and histograms of harmonic means for the reported dependent and independent models to show that the chains did indeed converge to a stable level and the difference between dependent and independent models was constant

(Online Resource 3). Finally, we ran each analysis once using a much higher number of iterations (20,050,000) to ensure that the chains did not deviate again from the converged level (Figure available on request).

(insert Table 2 about here)

**Results**

General patterns

Of the 68 species in the sample, 38 (55.9%) were reported to share food with offspring. In no species was food shared among adults but not with offspring. Of those 38 species in which food was shared with offspring, in 17 (44.7%) food was also shared among adults. In particular, in 14 species males shared with females, and in seven species each males and females shared among themselves. This distribution of sharing among adults in relation to the presence of sharing with offspring and other predictor variables is summarized in Table 2. Fisher’s exact probabilities indicate that these variables are significantly associated. Restricting sharing to non-kin improved the association with coalition formation for males and females. This overview lends preliminary support to the hypothesis that sharing among adults is related to opportunities for partner choice.

Sharing with offspring

Sharing with offspring was significantly positively predicted by the degree of extractive foraging (GEE:  $F_{1,65}=7.23$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) but not by diet quality index ( $F_{1,65}=0.25$ ,  $P=0.62$ ) and the interaction term was a significant negative predictor ( $F_{1,65}=6.12$ ,  $P<0.05$ , see Table 3 for parameter estimates). This indicates that the difficulty of acquisition, rather than the nutritional quality of food predicts sharing with offspring

and that difficult high quality diets do not lead to more sharing than difficult low quality items.

#### Sharing among adults (any sex combination)

Species sharing among adults represented a strict subset of those species sharing with offspring (Figure 1, Table 2). Thus, sharing with offspring strongly predicted sharing among adults (GEE:  $F_{1,65}=21.75$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) whereas the two diet variables did not (*Extractive foraging*:  $F_{1,65}=2.42$ ,  $P=0.15$ ; *DQI*:  $F_{1,65}=0.95$ ,  $P=0.35$ ; see Table 3 for parameter estimates). The RJ MCMC provided very strong support for dependent evolution of these two traits: the log Bayes factor, comparing the harmonic means of the dependent and the independent model, was very high and the chain never (!) visited independent evolution (see Table 3). The posterior distribution of rate parameters (given in Online Resource 1 and summarized in Figure 3a) also strongly indicated dependent evolution (compare e.g.  $q_{13}$  vs.  $q_{24}$  for probability of evolutionary gain of the trait “sharing among adults” in absence or presence of the trait “sharing with offspring”).

Because sharing with offspring can thus be seen as a necessary precondition for or a constraint on the evolution of sharing among adults, we reduced our sample to species already sharing with offspring ( $N=38$ ) in order to further test what factors explain sharing among specific sex combinations of adults. The two diet variables did not predict sharing among adults in general and were also never significant if included in the subsequent models, thus the details of these analyses are not reported.

(insert Figure 2 about here)

(insert Table 3 about here)

#### Sharing among adults (specific sex combinations)

##### *From males to females*

The presence of multi-male groups significantly predicted sharing from males to females ( $F_{1,37}=6.53$ ,  $P<0.05$ , see Table 3) and the RJ MCMC also provided positive evidence for dependent evolution of these two traits (Table 3, Online Resource 1). Within single-male species ( $N=15$ ) male-female sharing only occurs in socially monogamous and never in single-male multi-female species (means: 0.20 vs. 0; because of the strong association, GEE could not be computed). Hence the female mate choice hypothesis for the evolution of sharing from males to females was supported (Figure 2a) whereas the pair-bonds hypothesis may be supported within single-male species.

Furthermore, the bibliographic frequency of female mate choice was significantly higher in multi-male species than in single-male species (Wilcoxon:  $W=432$ ,  $P<0.01$ , Online Resource 4), indicating that females in multi-male groups do indeed have more opportunities for mate choice which validates our use of this binary variable to measure female choice. Finally, within multi-male species ( $N=23$ ), the bibliographic frequency of female mate choice significantly predicts the bibliographic frequency of male-female food sharing (PGLS: *Intercept* ( $\pm$ SE) = 0.001 ( $\pm$ 0.003),  $t=0.37$ ,  $P=0.72$ ; *female mate choice* = 0.22 ( $\pm$ 0.09),  $t=2.35$ ,  $P<0.05$ , Online Resource 4), suggesting that male-female sharing is more frequent in multi-male species with more female choice.

#### Among males

The presence of male-male coalitions significantly predicted male-male sharing (GEE:  $F_{1,37}=6.15$ ,  $P<0.05$ , Table 3, Figure 2b) and the RJ MCMC also provided strong support for dependent evolution (Table 3, Figure 3b, Online Resource 1). Hence, the hypothesis that male-male sharing co-evolved with male-male coalitions was supported.

To further exclude the influence of kinship, species for which sharing has only been reported among (confirmed or suspected) relatives were given a “0”. Specifically, this concerned *Saguinus fuscicollis* and *Pithecia pithecia*, both of which do not form male-male coalitions (Table 1). Because there was an even stronger association between sharing (1) and coalition formation (1) and not sharing (0) and no coalition formation (0) respectively in the resulting sample (cf. Table 2), GEE’s could not be computed. However, as expected from this stronger association, the RJ MCMC provided even stronger support for correlated evolution of sharing among unrelated males and male-male coalitions (Table 3, Figure 3b, Online Resource 1). Thus, the hypothesis that male-male sharing co-evolved with male-male coalitions was supported even better when only sharing among unrelated males was considered.

#### Among females

The presence of female-female coalitions significantly predicted sharing (GEE:  $F_{1,37}=7.91$ ,  $P<0.05$ , Table 3, Figure 2c) and the RJ MCMC also provided strong evidence for dependent evolution (Table 3, Figure 3b, Online Resource 1). Hence, the hypothesis that female-female sharing co-evolved with female-female coalitions was supported.

To further exclude the influence of kin selection, species for which sharing has only been reported among (confirmed or suspected) relatives were given a “0”. Specifically, this concerned *Nomascus concolor*, *Pongo abelii* and *Pongo pygmaeus*. No relatedness information could be obtained for the group of *Pygathrix nemaeus* studied by Kavanagh (1972), hence non-kin food sharing was treated as unknown. None of these species form female-female coalitions (Table 1). Again, because there was an even stronger association between sharing (1) and coalition formation (1) and not

sharing (0) and no coalition formation (0) respectively in the resulting dataset (cf. Table 2), GEE's could not be computed. However, as expected from this stronger association, the RJ MCMC provided even stronger support for correlated evolution of sharing among unrelated females and female-female coalitions (Table 3, Figure 3b, Online Resource 1). Thus, the hypothesis that female-female sharing co-evolved with female-female coalitions was supported even better when only sharing among unrelated females was considered.

(insert Figure 3 about here)

**Discussion**

In this study, we tested several hypotheses about the evolution of food sharing in primates. Firstly, sharing with offspring was predicted by the degree of extractive foraging, which should indicate the relative processing difficulty of food items and thus the relative benefits to offspring gained from food transfers. Secondly, sharing with offspring in return strongly predicted sharing among adults to the extent that the latter could only evolve in presence of the former (see Figure 3a). Diet variables on the other hand did not predict sharing among adults. Thirdly, food sharing among (unrelated) adults coevolved with conditions for partner choice and thus the opportunity for reciprocal exchange (see Figure 3b). In particular, our analyses suggest that males share with females whenever these can bias matings to other males, i.e. when there is opportunity for female mate choice ("food for sex"), and males and females share in species that form coalitions ("food for support"). By excluding sharing among relatives, we could rule out kin selection as a primary evolutionary mechanism. Thus, reciprocal exchange seems to be a main explanation accounting for the presence of sharing among unrelated adults across a large sample of primates. These overall findings are

summarized in Figure 4. In addition, there was some indication that within single-male species, male-female sharing was more common in socially monogamous species. The current analyses could in the future be extended with more detailed behavioral variables such as sex-combination specific grooming rates, the frequency of coalitions and their influence on reproductive success, the actual amount of exerted female mate choice (e.g. the percentage of female-initiated matings), etc. and predict frequencies rather than just presence of sex-combination specific sharing.

(insert Figure 4 about here)

The result that sharing coevolved with opportunities for partner choice across a broad range of species is in line with more detailed, within-species analyses testing for the exchange of food with itself and various other services between individuals of the same population (e.g. de Waal 1989; de Waal 1997; de Waal 2000; Gilby 2006; Mitani 2006; Gomes and Boesch 2009; Jaeggi et al. 2010c). As laid out in the introduction, the fact that sharing is most often elicited by harassment does not speak against the occurrence of reciprocal exchange in a statistically measurable way that can be under selection. This study thus lends further support to the growing body of evidence for the reciprocal exchange of low-cost altruistic acts among primates (Silk 2002; Schino 2007; Schino and Aureli 2009).

Sharing among adults only evolved in a subset of species, namely those in which sharing with offspring had already been established, indicating that the preexistence of sharing with offspring may constrain the evolution of sharing among adults (Figure 3a). The latter can therefore be seen as derived behavior (Tinbergen 1952), which could be pressed into service in another context. An analogous example would be courtship feeding in birds (Amat 2000), which is clearly derived from offspring provisioning,



employing the same behavioral patterns (Lorenz 1965). Interestingly, courtship feeding is also used among juvenile birds to strengthen social bonds (von Bayern et al. 2007) or establish dominance relationships (Scheid et al. 2008). However, the bird studies also show a clear functional difference between *possessor-initiated* sharing, which is derived from provisioning and actively used as a costly signal, and *recipient-initiated* sharing, which is a passive response to a request by an important social partner and may thus lead to reciprocal exchange (Scheid et al. 2008). Only the latter form is common among adult primates (Jaeggi et al. 2010a).

Diet did not seem to predict or constrain sharing among adults as the diet variables included in the analysis never improved the models or reached significance. It may well be that the diet variables were too broad to capture any variation in the occurrence of feeding situations with cost/benefit-ratios conducive to food transfers that may exist between species (Kaplan and Hill 1985). On the other hand, while certain food types such as meat and large fruit in the diet will surely lead to *more frequent* sharing, the fact that sharing also occurs with trivial food items (Kavanagh 1972; Slocombe and Newton-Fisher 2005; van Noordwijk and van Schaik 2009) indicates that diet alone cannot explain the presence of sharing *per se*.

Although the associations we found between food sharing and the predictor variables were significant, they were not absolute. Thus, some species in which sharing could potentially have been used to maintain coalitionary relationships or facilitate mate choice did not do so (cf. Table 2). For instance, no sharing occurs among olive baboon males despite the presence of male-male coalitions (Table 1). This can be explained by the steep dominance hierarchy in this species, allowing dominant males to acquire food by force and not having to depend on (and thus share with) other males for coalitionary

support. Coalitions are only formed by post-prime males who do not get a chance to become food possessors and thus cannot trade food for support (Strum 1975; Strum 1981; Noë and Sluijter 1995). Similar arguments can be made for dominance constraints on food for support among females or female mate choice. Hence strong dominance hierarchies can obviate opportunities for reciprocal exchange (Trivers 1971; Noë and Hammerstein 1995; Jaeggi et al. 2010c).

Given shareable items and the conditions shown here to be associated with sharing, our results allow predictions that tested with more detailed analyses. For instance, the causal link between multi-male groups and male-female sharing could be investigated by comparing single-male vs. multi-male groups of the same species (Hamilton and Bulger 1992; Launhardt et al. 2001) or by comparing closely related modular and non-modular species (Yeager and Kirkpatrick 1998; Grueter and van Schaik 2009). In particular, among Asian colobines tolerance within one-male units is higher in modular species (Grueter 2009) and some sharing has been reported in captivity (Kavanagh 1972; Zhang et al. 2008). Furthermore, species with high levels of cooperation among males, such as *Ateles geoffroyi* (Aureli et al. 2006) or *Cacajao calvus* (Bowler and Bodmer 2009), should have evolved strong bonds potentially expressed in sharing. If sharing is rare or absent in the wild, simple experiments using monopolizable food in captivity (e.g. de Waal 1989; de Waal 1997; Zhang et al. 2008; Jaeggi et al. 2010c) could be used to test these predictions.

Furthermore, any other animal species in which opportunities for partner choice and thus social bonds occur should potentially share food. However, diet type may turn out to be a stronger constraint on sharing than in primates, where virtually every species consumes some items prone to be shared (Harding 1981). For instance, dolphins and

571 other toothed whales form alliances and have long-lasting social relationships (Connor  
572 et al. 1998; Connor 2007) but there are only a few reports of food sharing (Johnson  
573 1982; Hoelzel 1991; Guinet et al. 2000), probably because the majority of consumed  
574 items (fish) are too small to be shared and because of observation difficulties. Similarly,  
575 elephants (Poole and Moss 2008) and many birds (Emery et al. 2007) have complex  
576 social relationships but may not encounter food items likely to be shared. Nonetheless,  
577 these species could easily be tested in captivity. On the other hand, very large food  
578 items such as animal carcasses containing many times the quantity an individual could  
579 consume alone make sharing almost inevitable because the benefits of defending are  
580 minimal to the point of monopolization becoming impractical. Thus, carcass sharing  
581 occurs in ravens (Heinrich 1988a; Heinrich 1988b) and many social carnivores (e.g.  
582 East and Hofer 1991) but may not represent sharing as defined here and is thus not  
583 necessarily linked to exchange of other favors. Furthermore, some instances of non-kin  
584 sharing among animals clearly serve other functions such as mate provisioning (Vahed  
585 1998) or costly signaling (Zahavi 1990; Scheid et al. 2008).

586       Lastly, food sharing is also a universal feature of human forager societies and  
587 most of the functional hypotheses discussed here probably apply to some extent (Kaplan  
588 and Hill 1985; Hawkes 1993; Gurven 2004; Marlowe 2004; Gurven and Hill 2009).  
589 However, it should be noted that rather than being a relatively infrequent event as in  
590 primates, human food sharing takes the form of daily provisioning both within and  
591 between families and is an indispensable component of the human foraging niche and  
592 cooperative breeding system (Kaplan and Gurven 2005; Hrdy 2009; Kaplan et al. 2009).  
593 Thus, sharing has a higher adaptive value than in other species which has probably led  
594 to a more active and prosocial sharing psychology in humans (Jaeggi et al. 2010a).

**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Michael Gurven, Karin Isler, Charles Nunn, Gabrielle Russo, Maria van Noordwijk, Janneke van Woerden, the UCSB's Human Behavioral Ecology Lab and several anonymous reviewers for discussions and many helpful comments on earlier versions of the manuscript. We also thank Charles Nunn for sharing parts of his forthcoming book "*The comparative method in evolutionary anthropology and biology*" which was highly informative for the methods used in this study. Finally, we are very grateful to the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant PBZHP3-133433), the Cogito Foundation (grant S-106/06) and the A.H. Schultz Foundation for financial support to AJ. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**References**

- Amat JA (2000) Courtship feeding, food sharing, or tolerated food theft among paired red-crested pochards (*Netta rufina*)? *Journal für Ornithologie* 141:327-334
- Aureli F, Schaffner CM, Verpooten J, Slater K, Ramos-Fernandez G (2006) Raiding parties of male spider monkeys: Insights into human warfare? *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 131:486-497
- Bininda-Emonds ORP, Cardillo M, Jones KE, MacPhee RDE, Beck RMD, Grenyer R, Price SA, Vos RA, Gittleman JL, Purvis A (2007) The delayed rise of present-day mammals. *Nature* 446:507-512
- Blurton Jones NG (1984) A selfish origin for human food sharing: Tolerated theft. *Ethology and Sociobiology* 5:1-3
- Blurton Jones NG (1987) Tolerated theft: Suggestions about the ecology and evolution of sharing, hoarding, and scrounging. *Social Science Information* 26:31-54

- 618 Bowler M, Bodmer M (2009) Social behavior in fission-fusion groups of red uakari  
619 monkeys (*Cacajao calvus ucayalii*). *American Journal of Primatology* 71:976-  
620 987
- 621 Brown GR, Almond REA, Van Bergen Y (2004) Begging, stealing, and offering: Food  
622 transfer in nonhuman primates. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* 34:265-295
- 623 Cashdan EA (1997) Comment on Bliege Bird and Bird: Delayed reciprocity and  
624 tolerated theft. *Current Anthropology* 38:69-70
- 625 Clutton-Brock T, McAuliffe K (2009) Female mate choice in mammals. *Quarterly*  
626 *Review of Biology* 84:3-27
- 627 Clutton-Brock TH (1991) *The evolution of parental care*. Princeton Univ Press,  
628 Princeton, NJ
- 629 Clutton-Brock TH (2009) Cooperation between non-kin in animal societies. *Nature*  
630 462:51-57
- 631 Connor RC (2007) Dolphin social intelligence: complex alliance relationships in  
632 bottlenose dolphins and a consideration of selective environments for extreme  
633 brain size evolution in mammals. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*  
634 *Society B: Biological Sciences* 362:587-602
- 635 Connor RC, Mann J, Tyack PL, Whitehead H (1998) Social evolution in toothed  
636 whales. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 13:228-232
- 637 Cords M (1997) Friendships, alliances, reciprocity and repair. In: Whiten A, Byrne RW  
638 (eds) *Machiavellian intelligence II: Extensions and evaluations*. Cambridge Univ  
639 Press, Cambridge, UK, pp 24-49
- 640 de Waal FBM (1989) Food sharing and reciprocal obligations among chimpanzees.  
641 *Journal of Human Evolution* 18:433-459

- 642 de Waal FBM (1997) The chimpanzee's service economy: Food for grooming.  
643 Evolution and Human Behavior 18:375-386
- 644 de Waal FBM (2000) Attitudinal reciprocity in food sharing among brown capuchin  
645 monkeys. Animal Behaviour 60:253-261
- 646 East ML, Hofer H (1991) Loud calling in a female-dominated mammalian society: II.  
647 Behavioural contexts and functions of whooping of spotted hyaenas, *Crocuta*  
648 *crocuta*. Animal Behaviour 42:651-669
- 649 Emery NJ, Seed AM, von Bayern AMP, Clayton NS (2007) Cognitive adaptations of  
650 social bonding in birds. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-  
651 Biological Sciences 362:489-505
- 652 Feistner ATC, McGrew WC (1989) Food-sharing in primates: A critical review. In:  
653 Seth PK, Seth S (eds) Perspectives in primate biology. Volume 3. Today and  
654 Tomorrow's Printers and Publishers, New Delhi, India, pp 21-36
- 655 Fish JL, Lockwood CA (2003) Dietary constraints on encephalization in primates.  
656 American Journal of Physical Anthropology 120:171-181
- 657 Forss SIF, van Noordwijk MA, Jaeggi AV, Meulman EM, van Schaik CP (2009) Social  
658 construction of the feeding niche in orang-utans: a comparative study. Folia  
659 Primatologica 80:117-118
- 660 Fragaszy DM, Mason WA (1983) Comparisons of feeding behavior in captive squirrel  
661 and titi monkeys (*Saimiri sciureus* and *Callicebus moloch*). Journal of  
662 Comparative Psychology 97:310-326
- 663 Gibson KR (1986) Cognition, brain size and the extraction of embedded food resources.  
664 In: Else J, Lee PC (eds) Primate ontogeny, cognition and social behaviour.  
665 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

- 666 Gilby IC (2006) Meat sharing among the Gombe chimpanzees: harassment and  
667 reciprocal exchange. *Animal Behaviour* 71:953-963
- 668 Gilby IC, Emery Thompson M, Ruane JD, Wrangham RW (2010) No evidence of short-  
669 term exchange of meat for sex among chimpanzees. *Journal of Human Evolution*  
670 59:44-53
- 671 Gomes CM, Boesch C (2009) Wild chimpanzees exchange meat for sex on a long-term  
672 basis. *PLoS ONE* 4:e5116
- 673 Gomes CM, Mundry R, Boesch C (2009) Long-term reciprocation of grooming in wild  
674 West African chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological*  
675 *Sciences* 276:699-706
- 676 Grueter CC (2009) Determinants of modular societies in snub-nosed monkeys  
677 (*Rhinopithecus bieti*) and other Asian colobines. PhD thesis. In. University of  
678 Zurich, Zurich
- 679 Grueter CC, van Schaik CP (2009) Sexual size dimorphism in Asian colobines  
680 revisited. *American Journal of Primatology* 71:609-616
- 681 Guinet C, Barrett-Lennard LG, Loyer B (2000) Co-ordinated attack behavior and prey  
682 sharing by killer whales at Crozet archipelago: Strategies for feeding on  
683 negatively-buoyant prey. *Marine Mammal Science* 16:829-834
- 684 Gurven M (2004) To give and to give not: The behavioral ecology of human food  
685 transfers. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 27:543-583
- 686 Gurven M, Hill K (2009) Why do men hunt? A reevaluation of "man the hunter" and  
687 the sexual division of labor. *Current Anthropology* 50:51-74
- 688 Hamilton WD (1964) Genetical evolution of social behaviour I. *Journal of Theoretical*  
689 *Biology* 7:1-16

- 690 Hamilton WJ, Bulger J (1992) Facultative expression of behavioral differences between  
691 one-male and multimale savanna baboon groups. *American Journal of*  
692 *Primatology* 28:61-71
- 693 Harding RSO (1981) An order of omnivores: Nonhuman primate diets in the wild. In:  
694 Harding RSO, Teleki G (eds) *Omnivorous primates: Gathering and hunting in*  
695 *human evolution*. Columbia University Press, New York, pp 191-214
- 696 Hawkes K (1993) Why hunter-gatherers work - an ancient version of the problem of  
697 public goods. *Current Anthropology* 34:341-361
- 698 Heinrich B (1988a) Food sharing in the raven, *Corvus corax*. In: Slobodchikoff CN (ed)  
699 *The ecology of social behavior*. Academic Press, San Diego, pp 285-311
- 700 Heinrich B (1988b) Winter foraging at carcasses by 3 sympatric corvids, with emphasis  
701 on recruitment by the raven, *Corvus corax*. *Behavioral Ecology and*  
702 *Sociobiology* 23:141-156
- 703 Hill K, Kaplan H (1993) On why male foragers hunt and share food. *Current*  
704 *Anthropology* 34:701-706
- 705 Hockings KJ, Humle T, Anderson JR, Biro D, Sousa C, Ohashi G, Matsuzawa T (2007)  
706 Chimpanzees share forbidden fruit. *PLOS ONE* 2:e886(online 1-4)
- 707 Hoelzel AR (1991) Killer whale predation on marine mammals at Punta Norte,  
708 Argentina - Food sharing, provisioning and foraging strategy. *Behavioral*  
709 *Ecology and Sociobiology* 29:197-204
- 710 Hohmann G, Fruth B (2008) New records on prey capture and meat eating by bonobos  
711 at Lui Kotale, Salonga National Park, Democratic Republic of Congo. *Folia*  
712 *Primatologica* 79:103-110



- 713 Hrdy S (2009) Mothers and others: The evolutionary origins of mutual understanding.  
714 Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- 715 Hrdy SB (1999) Mother nature: Maternal instincts and how they shape the human  
716 species. Ballantine Books, New York
- 717 Jaeggi AV, Burkart JM, van Schaik CP (2010a) On the psychology of cooperation in  
718 humans and other primates: Combining the natural history and experimental  
719 evidence of prosociality. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-  
720 Biological Sciences 365:2723-2735
- 721 Jaeggi AV, Dunkel LP, van Noordwijk MA, Wich SA, Sura AAL, van Schaik CP  
722 (2010b) Social learning of diet and foraging skills among wild immature  
723 Bornean orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii*): Implications for culture.  
724 American Journal of Primatology 72:62-71
- 725 Jaeggi AV, Stevens JMG, van Schaik CP (2010c) Tolerant food sharing and reciprocity  
726 is precluded by despotism in bonobos but not chimpanzees. American Journal of  
727 Physical Anthropology 143:41-51
- 728 Johnson RH (1982) Food-sharing behavior in captive Amazon river dolphins (*Inia*  
729 *geoffrensis*). Cetology 43:1-3
- 730 Kaplan H, Gurven M (2005) The natural history of human food sharing and  
731 cooperation: A review and a new multi-individual approach to the negotiation of  
732 norms. In: Gintis H, Bowles S, Boyd R, Fehr E (eds) Moral sentiments and  
733 material interests: The foundations of cooperation in economic life. MIT Press,  
734 Cambridge, pp 75-113
- 735 Kaplan H, Hill K (1985) Food sharing among Ache foragers: Tests of explanatory  
736 hypotheses. Current Anthropology 26:223-246

- 737 Kaplan HS, Hooper PL, Gurven M (2009) The evolutionary and ecological roots of  
738 human social organization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-*  
739 *Biological Sciences* 364:3289-3299
- 740 Kavanagh M (1972) Food-sharing behavior within a group of douc monkeys (*Pygathrix*  
741 *nemaeus nemaeus*). *Nature* 239:406-7
- 742 Kawanaka K (1982) Further studies on predation by chimpanzees of the Mahale  
743 Mountains. *Primates* 23:364-384
- 744 Keddy-Hector AC (1992) Mate choice in non-human primates. *American Zoologist*  
745 32:62-70
- 746 Launhardt K, Borries C, Hardt C, Epplen JT, Winkler P (2001) Paternity analysis of  
747 alternative male reproductive routes among the langurs (*Semnopithecus entellus*)  
748 of Ramnagar. *Animal Behaviour* 61:53-64
- 749 Lorenz K (1965) *Evolution and the modification of behavior*. Chicago University Press,  
750 Chicago
- 751 Marlowe FW (2004) What explains Hadza food sharing? *Research in Economic*  
752 *Anthropology* 23:69-88
- 753 Mas F, Kölliker M (2008) Maternal care and offspring begging in social insects:  
754 chemical signalling, hormonal regulation and evolution. *Animal Behaviour*  
755 76:1121-1131
- 756 Massen JJM, Sterck EHM, de Vos H (2010) Close social associations in animals and  
757 humans: functions and mechanisms of friendship. *Behaviour* 147:1379-1412
- 758 Mitani JC (2006) Reciprocal exchange in chimpanzees and other primates. In: Kappeler  
759 PM, van Schaik CP (eds) *Cooperation in primates and humans: mechanisms and*  
760 *evolution*. Springer, New York, pp 107-119

- 761 Mitani JC, Watts DP (2001) Why do chimpanzees hunt and share meat? *Animal*  
762 *Behaviour* 61:915-924
- 763 Nettelbeck AR (1998) Observations on food sharing in wild lar gibbons (*Hylobates lar*).  
764 *Folia Primatologica* 69:386-391
- 765 Nishida T, Hasegawa T, Hayaki H, Takahata Y, Uehara S (1992) Meat-sharing as a  
766 coalition strategy by an alpha male chimpanzee? In: Nishida T, McGrew WC,  
767 Marler P, Pickford M, De Waal FBM (eds) *Topics in primatology. Volume 1:*  
768 *Human origins*. University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, pp 159-174
- 769 Noë R, Hammerstein P (1995) Biological markets. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*  
770 10:336-339
- 771 Noë R, Sluijter A (1995) Which adult male savanna baboons form coalitions?  
772 *International Journal of Primatology* 16:77-105
- 773 Pagel M, Meade A *BayesTraits*. In, 1.0 edn. Reading Evolutionary Biology Group,  
774 [www.evolution.rdg.ac.uk](http://www.evolution.rdg.ac.uk)
- 775 Pagel M, Meade A (2006) Bayesian analysis of correlated evolution of discrete  
776 characters by reversible-jump Markov chain Monte Carlo. *American Naturalist*  
777 167:808-825
- 778 Pagel M, Meade A, Barker D (2004) Bayesian estimation of ancestral character states  
779 on phylogenies. *Systematic Biology* 53:673-684
- 780 Paradis E (2006) *Analysis of phylogenetics and evolution with R*. Springer, New York
- 781 Paradis E, Bolker BM, Claude J, Cuong HS, Desper R, Durand B, Dutheil J, Gascuel O,  
782 Jobb G, Heibl C, Lawson D, Lefort V, Legendre P, Lemon J, Noel Y, Nylander  
783 J, Opgen-Rhein R, Strimmer K, de Vienne D (2009) Analyses of phylogenetics  
784 and evolution. In:

- 785 Perry S, Rose L (1994) Begging and transfer of coati meat by white-faced capuchin  
786 monkeys, *Cebus capucinus*. *Primates* 35:409-415
- 787 Plavcan JM, van Schaik CP, Kappeler PM (1995) Competition, coalitions and canine  
788 size in primates. *Journal of Human Evolution* 28:245-276
- 789 Poole JH, Moss CJ (2008) Elephant sociality and complexity: The scientific evidence.  
790 In: Wemmer C, Christen K (eds) *Elephants and Ethics: Towards a morality of*  
791 *coexistence*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore
- 792 R Development Core Team (2010) R: A language and environment for statistical  
793 computing. In: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria
- 794 Rapaport LG, Brown GR (2008) Social influences on foraging behaviour in young  
795 nonhuman primates: Learning what, where and how to eat. *Evolutionary*  
796 *Anthropology* 17:189-201
- 797 Rowe N (1996) *The pictorial guide to the living primates*. Pogonias Press, Charlestown
- 798 Scheid C, Schmidt J, Noë R (2008) Distinct patterns of food offering and co-feeding in  
799 rooks. *Animal Behaviour* 76:1701-1707
- 800 Schessler T, Nash LT (1977) Food sharing among captive gibbons (*Hylobates lar*).  
801 *Primates* 18:677-689
- 802 Schino G (2007) Grooming and agonistic support: a meta-analysis of primate reciprocal  
803 altruism. *Behavioral Ecology* 18:115-120
- 804 Schino G, Aureli F (2009) Reciprocal altruism in primates: Partner choice, cognition,  
805 and emotions. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* 39:45-69
- 806 Silk JB (2002) Using the 'F'-word in primatology. *Behaviour* 139:421-446

- 807 Slocombe KE, Newton-Fisher NE (2005) Fruit sharing between wild adult chimpanzees  
808 (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*): A socially significant event? American Journal  
809 of Primatology 65:385-391
- 810 Stanford CB (1999) The hunting apes: meat eating and the origins of human behavior.  
811 Princeton Univ Press, Princeton
- 812 Stevens JR (2004) The selfish nature of generosity: harassment and food sharing in  
813 primates. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological  
814 Sciences 271:451-456
- 815 Stevens JR, Gilby IC (2004) A conceptual, framework for nonkin food sharing: timing  
816 and currency of benefits. Animal Behaviour 67:603-614
- 817 Stevens JR, Hauser MD (2004) Why be nice? Psychological constraints on the  
818 evolution of cooperation. Trends in Cognitive Sciences 8:60-65
- 819 Stevens JR, Stephens DW (2002) Food sharing: a model of manipulation by  
820 harassment. Behavioral Ecology 13:393-400
- 821 Strum SC (1975) Primate predation: Interim report on the development of a tradition in  
822 a troop of olive baboons. Science 187:755-757
- 823 Strum SC (1981) Processes and products of change: Baboon predatory behavior at  
824 Gilgil, Kenya. In: Harding RSO, Teleki G (eds) Omnivorous primates:  
825 Gathering and hunting in human evolution. Columbia University Press, New  
826 York, pp 255-302
- 827 Tinbergen N (1952) "Derived" activities; their causation, biological significance, origin,  
828 and emancipation during evolution. The Quarterly Review of Biology 27:1-32
- 829 Tomasello M, Call J (1997) Primate cognition. Oxford Univ Press, New York

- 830 Trivers RL (1971) Evolution of reciprocal altruism. Quarterly Review of Biology 46:35-  
831 57
- 832 Utami SS, van Hooff JARAM (1997) Meat-eating by adult female Sumatran orangutans  
833 (*Pongo pygmaeus abelii*). American Journal of Primatology 43:159-165
- 834 Vahed K (1998) The function of nuptial feeding in insects: review of empirical studies.  
835 Biological Reviews 73:43-78
- 836 van Noordwijk MA, van Schaik CP (2009) Intersexual food transfer among orangutans:  
837 do females test males for coercive tendency? Behavioral Ecology and  
838 Sociobiology 63:883-890
- 839 van Schaik CP, Fox EA, Sitompul AF (1996) Manufacture and use of tools in wild  
840 Sumatran orangutans - Implications for human evolution. Naturwissenschaften  
841 83:186-188
- 842 van Schaik CP, van Hooff JARAM (1983) On the ultimate causes of primate social  
843 systems. Behaviour 85:91-117
- 844 von Bayern AMP, de Kort SR, Clayton NS, Emery NJ (2007) The role of food- and  
845 object-sharing in the development of social bonds in juvenile jackdaws (*Corvus*  
846 *monedula*). Behaviour 144:711-733
- 847 Watts DP (2002) Reciprocity and interchange in the social relationships of wild male  
848 chimpanzees. Behaviour 139:343-370
- 849 White F (1994) Food sharing in wild pygmy chimpanzees (*Pan paniscus*). In: Roeder  
850 JJ, Thierry B, Anderson JR, Herrenschildt N (eds) Current Primatology  
851 Volume II: Social development, learning and behavior, vol 2. Université Louis  
852 Pasteur, Strasbourg, pp 1–10

- 853 Wolovich CK, Evans S, French JA (2008a) Dads do not pay for sex but do buy the  
854 milk: food sharing and reproduction in owl monkeys (*Aotus* spp.). *Animal*  
855 *Behaviour* 75:1155-1163
- 856 Wolovich CK, Feged A, Evans S, Green SM (2006) Social patterns of food sharing in  
857 monogamous owl monkeys. *American Journal of Primatology* 68:663-674
- 858 Wolovich CK, Perea-Rodriguez JP, Fernandez-Duque E (2008b) Food transfers to  
859 young and mates in wild owl monkeys (*Aotus azarai*). *American Journal of*  
860 *Primatology* 70:211-221
- 861 Ydenberg RC (1994) The behavioral ecology of provisioning in birds. *Ecoscience* 1:1-  
862 14
- 863 Yeager C, Kirkpatrick R (1998) Asian colobine social structure: Ecological and  
864 evolutionary constraints. *Primates* 39:147-155
- 865 Zahavi A (1990) Arabian babblers: the quest for social status in a cooperative breeder.  
866 In: Stacey PB, Koenig WD (eds) *Cooperative breeding in birds: Long-term*  
867 *studies of ecology and behavior*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp  
868 103-130
- 869 Zhang Z, Su YJ, Chan RCK, Reimann G (2008) A preliminary study of food transfer in  
870 Sichuan snub-nosed monkeys (*Rhinopithecus roxellana*). *American Journal of*  
871 *Primatology* 70:148-152
- 872
- 873

**TABLE 1:** List of all the species included in the comparative analyses and the variables of interest

Species <sup>a</sup>	FS	FS	FS	FS	FS	Extr.	DQI	Multi-	Monog.	♂-♂	♀-♀	Ref. <sup>b</sup>
	off.	ad.	♂-♀	♂-♂	♀-♀	For.		male		coal.	coal.	
<i>Alouatta palliata</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.43	1	0	0	0	1-4
<i>Aotus azarae</i>	2	2	1	0	0	0	0.65	0	1	0	0	5-7
<i>Ateles geoffroyi</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.61	1	0	1	0	8-10
<i>Callicebus discolor</i>	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.59	0	1	0	0	11,12
<i>Callicebus lugens</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.65	0	1	0	0	13
<i>Callimico goeldii</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	0	1	0	0	14-17
<i>Callithrix argentata</i>	2	0	0	0	0	1	0.67	1	1	0	0	18-20
<i>Callithrix jacchus</i>	2	1	1	0	0	1	0.67	1	1	0	0	21-32
<i>Callithrix pygmaea</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	0	1	0	0	33,34
<i>Cebus albifrons</i>	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.67	1	0	1	0	35
<i>Cebus apella</i>	1	1	1	1	1	2	0.87	1	0	1	1	36-43
<i>Cebus capucinus</i>	1	1	1	1	0	2	0.65	1	0	1	0	44-46
<i>Cebus olivaceus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.87	1	0	0	0	



<i>Cercocebus atys</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	0	0	0	
<i>Cercocebus torquatus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	0	0	1	
<i>Cercopithecus campbelli</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.70	0	0	0	0	
<i>Cercopithecus diana</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.69	0	0	0	0	
<i>Cercopithecus mitis</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.68	0	0	0	0	
<i>Chiropotes satanas</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	0	0	0	
<i>Chlorocebus aethiops</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.69	1	0	0	1	
<i>Colobus guereza</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.40	1	0	0	0	
<i>Daubentonia madagascarensis</i>	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.84	0	0	0	0	47-49
<i>Erythrocebus patas</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.69	0	0	0	0	
<i>Eulemur fulvus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.59	1	0	0	0	
<i>Eulemur rufus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.59	1	0	0	0	
<i>Galago senegalensis</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.63	0	0	0	0	50,51
<i>Gorilla beringei</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.34	0	0	0	0	52
<i>Gorilla gorilla</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.38	0	0	0	0	53
<i>Hylobates lar</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.71	0	1	0	0	54-59

<i>Indri indri</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.55	0	1	0	0	
<i>Lemur catta</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.59	1	0	0	0	
<i>Leontopithecus rosalia</i>	2	1	1	0	0	1	0.67	1	1	0	0	60-70
<i>Lophocebus albigena</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.69	1	0	0	1	
<i>Macaca arctoides</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	1	0	0	0	71
<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.74	1	0	1	1	72,73
<i>Macaca fuscata</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	1	0	0	1	74,75
<i>Macaca mulatta</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	1	0	0	1	
<i>Macaca nemestrina</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.62	1	0	0	1	
<i>Macaca radiata</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	1	0	1	0	
<i>Macaca silenus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	1	0	0	0	
<i>Macaca sylvanus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.68	1	0	1	0	
<i>Mandrillus sphinx</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	0	0	0	
<i>Microcebus murinus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.76	0	0	0	0	
<i>Nasalis larvatus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.53	1	0	0	0	
<i>Nomascus concolor</i>	1	1	0	0	1 <sup>c</sup>	0	0.43	0	1	0	0	76

<i>Nycticebus coucang</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.79	0	1	0	0	77
<i>Pan paniscus</i>	2	2	1	1	1	2	0.61	1	0	0	1	78-87
<i>Pan troglodytes</i>	2	2	1	1	1	2	0.61	1	0	1	1	88-136
<i>Papio anubis</i>	1	1	1	0	0	1	0.66	1	0	1	0	137-139
<i>Papio cynocephalus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.65	1	0	0	0	
<i>Papio hamadryas</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.66	1	0	0	0	
<i>Papio ursinus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.63	1	0	0	0	
<i>Ptilocolobus badius</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.40	1	0	1	0	140
<i>Pithecia pithecia</i>	1	1	0	1 <sup>c</sup>	0	0	0.67	0	0	0	0	141
<i>Pongo abelii</i>	2	1	1	0	1 <sup>c</sup>	2	0.59	1	0	0	0	142-144
<i>Pongo pygmaeus</i>	2	1	1	0	1 <sup>c</sup>	2	0.59	1	0	0	0	145-149
<i>Presbytis thomasi</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.55	0	0	0	0	
<i>Propithecus verreauxi</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.56	1	0	0	0	
<i>Pygathrix nemaeus</i>	1	1	1	0	1 <sup>d</sup>	0	0.54	1	0	0	0	150
<i>Saguinus fuscicollis</i>	2	1	0	1 <sup>c</sup>	0	0	0.67	1	1	0	0	151-153
<i>Saguinus mystax</i>	2	1	1	0	0	0	0.67	1	1	0	0	154,155

<i>Saguinus nigricollis</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	1	0	0	156
<i>Saguinus oedipus</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	1	0	0	157-168
<i>Saimiri sciureus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.94	1	0	0	1	169,170
<i>Semnopithecus entellus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.42	1	0	0	0	171
<i>Symphalangus syndactylus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.49	0	1	0	0	172
<i>Tarsius spectrum</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.00	0	1	0	0	173
<i>Theropithecus gelada</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.40	1	0	0	1	

<sup>a</sup>Species names follow Groves (2001) and Brandon-Jones et al. (2004)

<sup>b</sup>Ref. = References for food sharing information. The full citation information for this list can be obtained from the first author

<sup>c</sup>Food sharing only reported among (confirmed or suspected) relatives, as indicated by the respective authors. The species were consequently given a 0 in the non-kin only analyses

<sup>d</sup>No information on relatedness could be obtained for the subjects of this study and the occurrence of non-kin food sharing was thus treated as unknown in the respective analyses

FS = Food sharing, with offspring (off.), among adults (ad.), from males to females (♂-♀), among males (♂-♂), and among females (♀-♀) respectively. Extr. For. = The degree of extractive foraging, DQI = Diet quality index, Multi-male = multi-male groups, Monog. = Monogamy, ♂-♂ / ♀-♀ coal. = male-male and female-female coalitions respectively

References: <sup>1-4</sup>Carpenter (1934, 1965), Baldwin & Baldwin (1973), Whitehead (1986); <sup>5-7</sup>Wolovich et al. (2006, 2008a,b); <sup>8-10</sup>Dare (1974), Watt (1994), Pastor-Nieto (2001); <sup>11,12</sup>Fragaszy & Mason (1983), Wright (1984); <sup>13</sup>Starin (1978); <sup>14-17</sup>Lorenz (1969, 1972), Feistner & Price (1991), Jurke & Price (1994); <sup>18-20</sup>Carroll (1978), Omedes (1981), Feistner & Price (1991); <sup>21-32</sup>Epple (1967), Hearn & Lunn (1975), Chalmers & Lockehaydon (1984), Feistner & Price (1991), Vitale & Queyras (1997), Yamamoto & Box (1997), Westlund et al. (2000), Caldwell & Whiten (2003), Brown et al. (2005), de Lyra-Neves et al. (2007), Kasper et al. (2008), Saito et al. (2008); <sup>33,34</sup>Christen (1968), Feistner & Price (1991); <sup>35</sup>M. van Noordwijk & C. van Schaik (unpubl. data); <sup>36-43</sup>Thierry et al. (1989), de Waal et al. (1993), Frigaszy et al. (1997, 2004), Westergaard & Suomi (1997), Westergaard et al. (1998, 1999), de Waal (2000); <sup>44-46</sup>Perry & Rose (1994), Rose (1997, 2001); <sup>47-49</sup>Feistner & Ashbourne (1994), Winn (1994), Krakauer & van Schaik (2005); <sup>50,51</sup>Nash (1991, 1993); <sup>52</sup>Watts (1985); <sup>53</sup>Nowell & Fletcher (2006); <sup>54-59</sup>Carpenter (1940), Berkson & Schusterman (1964), Ellefson (1968), Fox (1972), Schessler & Nash (1977), Nettelbeck (1998); <sup>60-70</sup>Wilson (1976), Brown & Mack (1978), Hoage (1982), Price & Feistner (1993), Rapaport (1999, 2001, 2006), Ruiz-Miranda et al. (1999), Rapaport & Ruiz-Miranda (2002, 2006), Tardif et al. (2002); <sup>71</sup>Bertrand (1969); <sup>72,73</sup>Kummer & Cords (1991), M. van Noordwijk (pers.comm.); <sup>74,75</sup>Hikami et al. (1990), Matusbara & Funakoshi (2001); <sup>76</sup>Fan & Jiang (2009); <sup>77</sup>Zimmermann (1989); <sup>78-87</sup>Kano (1980), Badrian & Badrian (1984), Badrian & Malenky (1984), Kuroda (1984), de Waal (1992), Hohmann & Fruth (1993, 2008), White (1997), Fruth & Hohmann (2002), Surbeck & Hohmann (2008), Jaeggi et al. (2010); <sup>88-136</sup>Nissen & Crawford (1936), van Lawick-Goodall (1968), Nishida (1970, 1983), Suzuki (1971), Teleki (1973), McGrew (1975), Wrangham (1975), Silk (1978, 1979), Nishida et al. (1979, 1992), Tutin (1979), Kawanaka (1982), Takahata et al. (1984), Goodall (1986), Boesch & Boesch-Achermann (1989, 2000), de Waal (1989, 1992, 1997), Hiraiwa-Hasegawa (1990a,b),

Boesch (1994), Kuroda et al. (1996), Nishida & Turner (1996), Hemelrijk et al. (1999), Mitani & Watts (1999, 2001), Newton-Fisher (1999), Stanford (1999), Bethell et al. (2000), Nakamura & Itoh (2001), Hunt & McGrew (2002), Matsumoto-Oda (2002), Watts & Mitani (2002), Hirata & Celli (2003), Ueno & Matsuzawa (2004), Stevens (2004), Reynolds (2005), Slocombe & Newton-Fisher (2005), Gilby (2006), Lonsdorf (2006), Mitani (2006), Hockings et al. (2007), Pruett & Bertolani (2007), Gomes & Boesch (2009), Gilby et al. (2010), Jaeggi et al. (2010); <sup>137-139</sup>Harding (1973), Strum (1975, 1981); <sup>140</sup>Starin (2006); <sup>141</sup>Homburg (1997); <sup>142-144</sup>Utami & van Hooff (1997), van Noordwijk & van Schaik (2009), Forss et al. (2009); <sup>145-149</sup>Horr (1977), Bard (1987, 1992), Jaeggi et al. (2008), van Noordwijk & van Schaik (2009); <sup>150</sup>Kavanagh (1972); <sup>151-153</sup>Cebul & Eppe (1984), Yoneda (1984), Goldizen (1989); <sup>154,155</sup>Heymann (1996), Huck et al. (2004); <sup>156</sup>Izawa (1978); <sup>157-168</sup>Wolters (1978), Neyman (1989), Cleveland & Snowdon (1984), Feistner & Chamove (1986), Feistner & Price (1990, 1991, 1999), Savage et al. (1996), Roush & Snowdon (2000, 2001), Joyce & Snowdon (2007), Humle & Snowdon (2008) ; <sup>169,170</sup>Fragaszy & Mason (1983), Stevens (2004); <sup>171</sup>Jay (1965); <sup>172</sup>Fox (1972); <sup>173</sup>Gursky (2000)

**TABLE 2:** Contingency table showing the distribution of species in Table 1 across food sharing contexts and our predictor variables, as well as Fisher’s exact tests for the association of these variables

		Sharing with offspring <sup>a</sup>		Multiple-males <sup>b</sup>		Male-male coalitions <sup>c</sup>		Female-female coalitions <sup>c</sup>	
		<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>
Sharing among adults	<i>1</i>	17	0	12	2	4	3 (1)	3	4 (1/0)
	<i>0</i>	21	30	11	13	4	27 (29)	2	29 (32/33)
Fisher’s exact		<b>P&lt;0.001</b>		<b>P&lt;0.05</b>		<b>P&lt;0.05 (P&lt;0.01)</b>		<b>P&lt;0.05 (P&lt;0.01)</b>	

<sup>a</sup>This refers the whole sample (N=68) and any dyad of adults

<sup>b</sup>Multi-male species vs. single-male species; this refers to male-female sharing in species already sharing with offspring (N=38)

<sup>c</sup>This refers to male-male and female-female sharing respectively, in species already sharing with offspring (N=38). The numbers in parentheses refer to sharing only among non-kin (for females *Pygathrix nemaeus* assumed to be non-kin/kin)

**TABLE 3:** Overview of the comparative analyses testing for correlated evolution of food sharing and other traits, and the support for the related hypotheses. Significant factors are bold

Food sharing	N	Factors	GEE <sup>a</sup>	RJ MCMC <sup>b</sup>	Related hypotheses	Supported?
with offspring	68	Intercept	-1.03			
		<b>Extractive foraging</b>	1.86*		Informational hypothesis	+
		Diet quality index (DQI)	0.86		Nutritional hypothesis	-
		<b>Extractive foraging * DQI</b>	-2.32*			-
among adults	68	Intercept	-2.84			
(any sex combination)		<b>Sharing with offspring</b>	1.35***	P <sub>ind</sub> =0, BF=30.94	Constraint / Precondition	+++
		Extractive foraging	0.38			-
		DQI	-0.49			-
from males to females <sup>c</sup>	38	Intercept	-1.87			
		<b>Multi-male groups</b>	1.96*	P <sub>ind</sub> =0.004, BF=3.9	Female mate choice	+



		("Food for sex")				
among males <sup>c</sup>	38	Intercept	-2.20			
		<b>Male-male coalitions</b>	2.20*	P <sub>ind</sub> =0.001, BF=8.58	Coalition partner choice	++
				(P <sub>ind</sub> =0.0003, BF=9.94) <sup>d</sup>	("Food for support")	
among females <sup>c</sup>	38	Intercept	-1.98			
		<b>Female-female coalitions</b>	2.39*	P <sub>ind</sub> =0.001, BF=6.6	Coalition partner choice	++
				(P <sub>ind</sub> =0, BF=11.92) <sup>d</sup>	("Food for support")	

<sup>a</sup>GEE = Generalized Estimating Equations, a version of phylogenetic generalized least squares analyses used for discrete response variables (Paradis 2006). Reported are the parameter estimates (SE not available for GEE) with significance level (see text for F-values)


<sup>b</sup>RJ MCMC: Reversible-jump Markov chain Monte Carlo, a Bayesian method for testing dependent evolution of two discrete traits (Pagel & Meade 2006). Reported are the proportion of dependent models that jumped to independent evolution of the traits, indicated by the probability for independent evolution (P<sub>ind</sub>), as well as the log Bayes Factor (BF), which measures the fit of the dependent model relative to the independent model (see also Supplementary Table 1 for stability of Bayes Factors across different parameter settings of the models). By convention, a BF > 2 is taken as positive evidence for dependent evolution, >5 indicates strong positive evidence and >10 very strong positive evidence

<sup>c</sup>Only species in which there is food sharing with offspring

<sup>d</sup>The values in parentheses refer to the analyses restricted to sharing among nonkin


\*\*\*:  $P < 0.001$ , \*:  $P < 0.05$

For Review Only




The phylogenetic tree, based on Bininda-Emonds et al. (2007), of the 68 species in our sample representing all major taxonomic groups of primates (see Table 1). The traits “food sharing with offspring” and “food sharing among adults” are marked as present (black) or absent (white)

195x357mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Mean ( $\pm$  SEM) occurrence of food sharing a) from males to females, b) among males and c) among females, in species in which a) multi-male groups, b) male-male coalitions and c) female-female coalitions are absent (0) or present (1). In all cases, the occurrence of food sharing is significantly higher in species in which the traits are present. The significance values (\*:  $P < 0.05$ ) refer to the respective GEE models (Table 2)

59x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Mean ( $\pm$  SEM) occurrence of food sharing a) from males to females, b) among males and c) among females, in species in which a) multi-male groups, b) male-male coalitions and c) female-female coalitions are absent (0) or present (1). In all cases, the occurrence of food sharing is significantly higher in species in which the traits are present. The significance values (\*:  $P < 0.05$ ) refer to the respective GEE models (Table 2)

59x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Mean ( $\pm$  SEM) occurrence of food sharing a) from males to females, b) among males and c) among females, in species in which a) multi-male groups, b) male-male coalitions and c) female-female coalitions are absent (0) or present (1). In all cases, the occurrence of food sharing is significantly higher in species in which the traits are present. The significance values (\*:  $P < 0.05$ ) refer to the respective GEE models (Table 2)


59x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Flow charts for the evolution of food sharing among adults (first trait) in the presence or absence of a) food sharing with offspring and b) opportunities for partner choice (second traits), as analyzed with the RJ MCMC method. The thickness of the arrows is proportional to the mean value of the rate parameters  $q$  in the posterior sample and thus indicates the likelihood of the transition from one state to another. By comparing opposite arrows it can clearly be seen that the evolution of sharing among adults is much more likely if a) sharing with offspring or b) opportunities for partner choice is already present as a trait (and vice versa, although sharing among adults is unlikely to evolve first). The values of  $q$  in b) are the means of the sex-combination specific analyses, i.e. male-female, male-male and female-female sharing, and multi-male groups, male-male coalitions and female-female coalitions respectively (see Online Resources 1 for full details). Note that a) is based on 68 species while b) is based on only 38 species, namely those in which sharing with offspring was already present, and only refers to sharing among unrelated adults. Furthermore, note that only the arrows for evolutionary gains of traits are represented, the ones for losses were omitted in this figure (but not in the analyses, see Online Resources 1) because we here assume the ancestral state to be 0, 0

106x58mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Flow charts for the evolution of food sharing among adults (first trait) in the presence or absence of a) food sharing with offspring and b) opportunities for partner choice (second traits), as analyzed with the RJ MCMC method. The thickness of the arrows is proportional to the mean value of the rate parameters  $q$  in the posterior sample and thus indicates the likelihood of the transition from one state to another. By comparing opposite arrows it can clearly be seen that the evolution of sharing among adults is much more likely if a) sharing with offspring or b) opportunities for partner choice is already present as a trait (and vice versa, although sharing among adults is unlikely to evolve first). The values of  $q$  in b) are the means of the sex-combination specific analyses, i.e. male-female, male-male and female-female sharing, and multi-male groups, male-male coalitions and female-female coalitions respectively (see Online Resources 1 for full details). Note that a) is based on 68 species while b) is based on only 38 species, namely those in which sharing with offspring was already present, and only refers to sharing among unrelated adults. Furthermore, note that only the arrows for evolutionary gains of traits are represented, the ones for losses were omitted in this figure (but not in the analyses, see Online Resources 1) because we here assume the ancestral state to be 0, 0

107x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)





This figure summarizes our findings on the evolution of food sharing in primates: Of the 68 species in the total sample, sharing with offspring evolved in the subset of those with relatively difficult diets, as measured by the degree of extractive foraging, indicating differential acquisition of food by adults and offspring and thus high benefits to sharing. Within those 38 species sharing food with offspring, sharing among adults was more likely to evolve in the subset of species with opportunities for partner choice, indicating that food is shared in order to increase (or not decrease) the chance of future matings (between sexes) or coalitionary support (within sexes). NWM = New World monkeys,

OWM = Old World monkeys  
147x97mm (300 x 300 DPI)